

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action dated August 1, 2003. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-15, 17 and 19-25 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1-7 being independent. Claims 8, 10, 16 and 18 have been previously canceled. Claims 3-7 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Allowable subject matter

Appreciation is expressed for the indication that claims 12-13 and 22-23 contain allowable subject matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 9, 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 11-003675 to Atsushi in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,954,011 to Manske.

Claims 2, 17, 19-21 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as allegedly being obvious over Atsushi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,141,461 to Nishimura et al. (Nishimura) in further view of Manske.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The claims include a cushion film formed between the base film and the heat absorption film layer. The adhesiveness of the cushion film to the base film is stronger than the adhesiveness of the cushion film to the heat absorption film layer.

Atsushi arguably teaches a back plate of a cathode-ray tube and its manufacture that includes a base film 104 and a cushion film 105 (figure 4(a)). But the Office Action fails to identify which element within Atsushi is the claimed heat absorption film layer.

The Office Action also fails to explain how adhesiveness of the cushion film 105 to the base film 104 of Atsushi is stronger than the adhesiveness of the cushion film 105 to the heat absorption film layer. In this regard, please note that the base film 104 of Atsushi is removed prior to the removal of the cushion film 105 (figures 4(b)-(c)).

Moreover, the Office Action fails to show where within Atsushi are found the relationships of the adhesiveness of the cushion film to the base film and of the adhesiveness of the cushion film to the heat absorption film layer.

Additionally, the Office Action cites column 12, lines 6-10 for specific teachings within Atsushi. However, further note that column 12, lines 6-10 is not found within Atsushi.

Manske arguably teaches selected time interval indicating device, but fails to disclose, teach or suggest a cushion film formed between the base film and the heat absorption film layer.

Nishimura arguably depicts and adhesive 6 and a glass board 9, but fails to disclose, teach or suggest a cushion film formed between the base film and the heat absorption film layer.

Accordingly, if the allowance of the claims is not forthcoming at the very least, then a **new non-final Office Action** is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753, or the undersigned attorney.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: April 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant